G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. (1895-96.)

191 .

(L. R)

Later references.

100-95.

File No. ~~93-95~~ 1

Serial Nos. 1-10.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-10.

In ~~Part~~ B for August 1897

SUBJECT.

Dispute regarding the Shanbhogi of Tekahalli and 11 other Villages in the Sidalghatta Taluk —

W D 1250—GPB—30,000—28-1-19

Indexed by

Appeal No 125 of 1895-96.

Appellant.

Narasinga Row

Respondents

1. Venkalāsubbaiya
2. Dasappa.

Dispute regarding the Shanbhogi of Tekahalli and other villages in the Siddaghatta Taluk.

List of papers.

(1) Copy of Assistt Comr's order of 20. 7. 93.
(2) Do By Comr's order appealed against
(3) Appeal petition
(4) Offl Memorandum of 18. 3. 96
(5) Narasinga Row's petition of 18. 3. 96
(6) Offl Memorandum of 1. 4. 96.
(7) By Comr's docket of 25. 9. 96.

of the Dock Co
Sergeant Hall
the duties of
the 24 million
compact this
Fuller can be
duly Sworn & discharged
by a Police Magistrate.

29/10/96

Drafted
5/11

Memo

Appeal No. 125 of 1895-96.

Appellant:- Narasinga Rao
Sirkar Shanbhog of
Dod Tekhalli, Sidlaghatta
Taluk.

Respondents:- Venkata Subbia and
his son Dasappa.

The Dodda Tekhalli firka consists of 4 villages as noted in the margin - There are 2 Sthakdar Shanbhogs viz Sirkar & Stala, to this firka. Petitioner Narasinga Rao represents the Sirkar Shanbhogi family & the Respondents Venkata Subbia and his son Dasappa represent the Sthala Shanbhogi family - Petr. Narasinga Rao is in charge of the Shanbhogi of the first 2 villages noted above and the Respondents are in charge of the other two villages. It is alleged by both parties that they divided the villages in the year Sarvajitu and that they are enjoying their respective villages since Sarva dhari. At the Potigi Settlement the

* 1 Dodda Tekhalli
2. Bairaganahalli
3. Sadhalli
4. Bandammanakere.

villages were constituted into one firka and its Potigi fixed at Rs 85-8-0

On 30th May 1893 the 1st Respondent petitioned the Taluk Amildar praying that the whole of the Potigi of the firka may be paid to him. Petr Narasinga Rao also petitioned the Gent Asstt Comnr praying that the proportionate share of the Potigi attaching to the villages in his charge may be given to him. After hearing both parties the Gent Asstt Comnr passed an order directing that the Potigi be divided between the 2 Shanbhogs the Sthala Shanbhog getting Rs 5/4/1 & the Sirkar Shanbhog getting only Rs 2/4/- and that payment should be made accordingly. This order was carried out by the Amildar.

Subsequently the 1st Respt Venkata Subbia petitioned the Survey Supt praying that the work of the firka may be taken from him and the full amount of Potigi be paid to him. Thereupon the Survey Supt issued an order to the Amildar to report whether the Potigi amount has been divided as complained of by the

reported that at the time of the Potigi disbursement the Genl Asst Commr passed an order directing the division of the Potigi between the Shanbhogs and that that order had been carried out. Thereupon the Survey Supt issued the following order to the Amildar

"At the Potigi Settlement the Sirkar Shanbhog was relieved of his right to officiate and his Emboli lands were reserved as Inam subject to the payment of half quit-rent and that consequently no Potigi need be paid to him."

The Amildar brought this matter to the notice of the Genl Asst Commr, who, in turn forwarded the papers to the Dy Com for sending a reply to the Survey Supt on the subject.

In forwarding certain papers relating to the complaints of Sirkar & Uttala Shanbhogs of

of the Siddhapatta Taluk, together with certain statements showing particulars as to places where the Sirkar & Sthala Shanbhogs were doing work jointly and separately and places in which the Sirkar Shanbhogs were alone doing ~~duty~~ duty, for favour of the Survey Supt's opinion the Dy Comm^r asked for a reply on the following points.

(1) "As regards ~~certain~~ some Sirkar Shanbhogjikes the Inam lands of which are fully assessed, the Kudi lands have been included in calculating the Poligi. You state that the question of officiation should be enquired into & disposed of by me. It is further stated that the duty of such offices are in some places being performed by Sthala Shanbhos & in others by both Sirkar & Stala Shanbhogs. As, on the complaint of some Sthala Shanbogs you have issued orders that Sirkar Shanbogs have no right to officiate they can have no right in these villages also.

Potigi may be paid to them & work taken from them alone. How should these matters be settled? If Sirkar Shanbogs are to be relieved of them but the best thing will be to levy half quit-rent on their Inams.

(2) "In ~~such of the~~ these villages in which the Inam lands of the Sirkar Shanbog are charged with half quit-rent, the Sirkar & Stala Shgs have divided the villages between them and are enjoying them separately. The Potigi of ~~Sirsi~~ Naudana was divided between them proportionately by the consent of the Stala Shanbogs. These very Stala Shanbogs now urge that the Potigi of Vijaya may be wholly paid to them. The Sirkar Shanbogs also pray that the Potigi attaching to villages in their charge may be paid to them Though Stala Shanbogs agree to allow the Sirkar Shanbogs to conduct work, yet they complain that they suffer more than the ~~Sh~~ Sirkar Shg

This is the question raised in the present case and answered by the Survey Supt in terms rejecting the Petr's claims

inasmuch as the latters Inams
are charged with half jist-rent
while their own Inams are fully
assessed & only Potgi is there only remuneration
assessed & ~~only~~ Potgi is ~~agreed to them~~.

(3) "As regards such Sirkar &
State Shanbogs who divided the
villages in their charge after obtain-
ing Govt sanction, their Inams
are fully assessed and there is
no takarar about them.
Only in those cases in which
they divided the villages without
obtaining sanction of Govt, there is
some complaint. Though according
to the Govt Prop 1878 Sirkar Shanbogs
have no right to officiation yet it
is doubtful whether they can be disturbed
after ~~arbogtto op~~ having
worked so long. I therefore request
that you will favor me with
your opinion in the matter"

The Survey Supto Yadi contains
the following reply.

As regards the 1st point:- "both
practices are prevalent and there is
a doubt as to which should be followed.
Govt order will be sought for

and intimated to you.

2nd point. "No potigi is due to such Sirkar Shanbogs whose Inams are enfranchised on half quit-rent - The Inams of these Shanbogs ~~has~~ have been considered in fixing the Potigi. Potigi should be given to the person who is actually doing duty. This was intimated to you in Yadi No. 169 23-1-94. The division of Potigi which has been done by you is opposed to the above communication.

3rd " There can be no ~~doubt~~ objection to relieve the Sirkar Shanbogs from going duty as their Inams ~~are~~ bear half quit-rent. You admit the superior claim of the Slala Shg. As the Sirkar Shanbogs Inams are excluded in ~~adoshastra~~ the Potigi Settlement they have no right to claim to do duty. Consequently there is no reason ~~to attend~~ ~~to~~ to their takarar."

The Dy Commr forwarded the papers with the above Yadi's to the

guidance and further directed that pending the issue of final orders by the Survey Supt only half the assessment levied on Sirkar Shanbog Inam lands may be recovered.

Petr Narasinga Rao having ~~stated~~ continued to ~~pass~~ hold charge of the office though ordered by the Amildar to hand over charge, the Dy Commr passed an order at the Jamabandi in Decr 95 to the ~~following~~ effect that ~~double~~ attention should be given to the Survey Supts' Yadi above referred to and that the Sirkar Shanbhog should be relieved of his work. ~~which ordered~~ ~~be seconded from the State Shanbog.~~

Petr appeals to Govt against this order.

The Dy Commr who was asked to state in this office No. 4220/P. 625 dt 27th Oct 96 if the duties of all the 4 villages comprising this Firka can be satisfactorily discharged by a single officiator, now reports that the duties can be managed by a single man.

The following points are evident from the above

Bbn 23/11/97. (1) That both the Sirkar &

PLEASE

Sheikh Shamboyee (ce pet^{r} & C-pet^{r}) have kept them rights alive by threatening
(2) That the petitioner's name has been enfranchised on ½ quit-rent while the C-pet^{r}'s name has been fully assessed
(3) That the pet^{r}'s services can be dispensed with as the forkha is reported to be capable of being managed by a single man
These elements seem sufficient to bring into operation the Chief Comm^{r}'s proceedings of 1878.

Sd/-

M 27/7/97

This is a clear case & involves no element of doubt or difficulty I understand that Narasing a Rai is now the Sarkar of Shamboyee - His sons

being no longer required
his Mama was enfranchised
at half quotient. This
was the full
compensation he could get
in addition to relief
from liability to do any
work. That shanbogue
becomes the shanbogue
& gets the whole Sirgi
This is in accordance
with rules, & the Sirgi
allowance is reliable
to be divided between
the Officiating Sankar Shanbogue Nana
- nagabai's appeal
cannot in this new
be upheld and must
be dismissed.

28.7.97. WMS

Draft proceedings ready
Ms 5/8/97

Appeal order passed as
proposed in Ms above.
Hindi version
necessary for
guidance
WMS
3/8/97

This has W.M. & A.S. Sahebs ge
& Surveyor Subramil Chetty

I agree to the above orders, as
to the Sirgi allowance
that to the shanbogue of all the
four villages comprising the
Sirkhan can be taken
& a single officiating
shanbogue be appointed
to perform the duties
of the shanbogue
as far as possible
a Canarese, the case
of the Sirkhan shanbogue must

Subd by 3rd Councillor
Ms 30/7/97

Subd by 2nd Councillor
Ms 30/7/97

This case should be dealt with
by the Revenue Board. This matter
is not connected with the
Inspection
30.7.97

1895 - 96.

Petr. Sazawal is the appeal against the Dy. Com's order of 24/12/95.

Stamp sufficient

In time

Council Case.

~~From the Dy. Com's order~~

Sub Dy Clr

Dvd

A.S. 16/3/96

16/3/96

A.S.
16/3

Sort in the usual
comm. call for record
& proceedings

17/3/96

16/3/96

Draft. Ord.
Case to be posted
A.S. 16/3

Accepted

18.3.96

No. 3220.

Name of Petitioner, Appellant Narasingakan } Respondents Venkala Subbiah and his son Dasappa

Village, Jekhalli of

Taluk, Sidlaghatta

District, Kolar

Date of Arzi, 12-3-96

Date of Receipt, 14-3-96.

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil

ABSTRACT.

Appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, No. 3198/28-12-95 which runs as follow:-

"

Sidlaghatta Taluk Basettihalli Hobli Charge No. 7. Dodda Jekhalli, Sadhalli, Bairegana -halli & Bandammakere	"The Sthala Shan -bhog is Dasappa son of Venkala Subbiah and the Sirkar Shanbhog is Narasingakan

Half the quit-rent is charged for the Inam of lands of the Sirkar Shanbhog. But he has no right to do the Shanbhog duties. The Survey Superintendent's Yadi No. 6810 of 2-12-94, conveying the above idea is attached to this file. Genl. Apl. Comm

and Bairaganhalli villages and the Sthala Shanbhog the management of the other two villages, and that out of the total Poegi of Rs 85-8- the Sirkar Shanbhog should receive Rs 28-4-: and the balance viz Rs 57-4- should go to the Sthala Shanbhog, is also attached to this file. It is learnt that at present the above order is in force. The Sthala Shanbhog having appealed to the Survey Supt. the latter officer's decision which has been communicated to you in his ord. No. 1564 of 19-7-94, should now be attended to and a report made after relieving the Sirkar Shanbhog of the Shanbhog duties".

The Petr appeals on the following grounds:-

1. That the above order of the Dy Commr is against law and justice.
2. That it sets aside an established local law.
3. That the lower court has omitted to consider the proceedings of the case.
4. That from the enclosed old references it is evident that the Petrs claim is ~~an~~ illegal & unwarranted & Shebandi since the 2nd Respt
5. That the 1st Respondent has no ~~right for~~ dispute alone has been looking after the post for the last 20 years.
6. That the above order of the Dy Commr is against the Nirup of his late Highness Krishna Raja Wodeyar, the agreements of Petr & 2nd Respt, and their respective enjoyments &c.
7. That the Survey Supt's order based on the Chief Commr's Procs of 1877 is not just considering the facts & events that have transpired from the year 1824, the date of does not stand before the Nirup of his late Highness Krishna Raja Wodeyar
8. That in many similar cases the late Dr Krishna Iyengar Dy Comr of Kolar has given his decision quite contrary to & against the Chief Commr's Procs and that those records might be sent for in connection with this case.

Prays that after a careful perusal of all the old records and the entire file of correspondence an equitable order may be passed establishing his right to his hereditary Shanbhogship.

Further prays that orders may be issued to the Dy Commr not to give effect to his order till his appeal is disposed of.

(3)

3220

From Pathshor
To Pat. Branch

14/3/96

one one rupee stamp and two eight annas stamp affixed

M.S. No 125-95-96

MUNICIPAL DEWANS OFFICE
DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO 3220
DATE 14-3-96

(ક)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Petition Department
Regd. No. 3254 R
Date 19-3-96

Petn
19-3-96

Two rupees stamp affd

Replies and Rejoinder with
reference earlier
N.S.
19/5/96

1737 draft 2058 19-3-96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(2) (4)

LR 95-2

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition

Registered No. 3220 dated 12-3-96

received at the Dewan's Office from Narasinga Rao of Tekhalli village, Siddaghatta Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr, Kolar dt, regarding the office of Shanbhag of Hobli Tekhalli, Bairagunhalli village, Siddaghatta Taluk,

is forwarded, together with its nine enclosures to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case.

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned.

By order,

draft

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
18-3-1896.

18.3.96

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

L2190 17-3-96

2/8

Refee pubp Stamp sufficient

26/3

The appeal has been admitted and the records have been called for as per order of the 2nd Commr on petn No: 3220. This prayer had has been urged in the appeal petn also.

Subd Bd 1st Q

Asst
AS.
26/3/96

26/3/96

Mysore
order

Issued
31/3/96

189 6

No. 3254 (3)

Name of Petitioner, Narasingraya Shanbhog &c

Village, Tekahalli

Taluk, Sidlaghatta

District, Kolar

Date of Arzi, 18-3-96

Date of Receipt, 19-3-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil

ABSTRACT.

In continuation of his appeal against the order of the Dy. Commr. directing that he should hand over charge of the villages of Tekahalli and Byrapanahalli to the respondent Venkappa that as he is still in charge of the villages and as this is the collection season the order may be stayed under Section 26 of the Land Revenue Code & that the order of the Dy. Commr. in the mean time by directing to him to continue to conduct the duties of the said villages pending disposal of his appeal

LR 109-95-4

Per 1893 (4)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 3254 dated 18" March '96 received at the Dewan's Office from Narasinga Row of Jekakalli Sidlaghatta Taluk praying in continuation of his appeal petition dated 12" ultimo, that the Dy. Commr's order, ~~regarding Dod Jekakalli re applied agt May~~ is forwarded, together with its ~~enclosures~~, to the Dy. Commr. Kolar District in continuation of this Office O. M. No: Pet 1737 dated 18" March 1896, with a request execution of the that the Dy. Commr's order No: 3194 dated 28" Decem. -ber 1895, against which the petr has appealed, may be stayed pending the disposal of the appeal

2. The petition is returned.

By Order,

Bangalore, 1-4-1896

for Chief Secretary

VR 1/4/96

M.G.C.P.B.—19-2-95—1,000

X directing that Petr be relieved of the Sheristadiship of Dod Jekkalli & Baiyanhalli be stayed pending disposal of the appeal

Revenue councillors order
on the alphabet of petition 3220
of 12.3.96
Pet. Branch
3/10/96 28/9/96

2819

Gen. 31]

1896 96 LEWAN'S OFFICE

Pet 201

From Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue and Genl dept.

Dated 25th September
Despatched
Received 26th

General No. 1361
No. 345

Enclosure No. 1 file

With official memoranda
as per margin forwarding for adjudication
of Proceedings two petitions
from Narasinga Row
of Tekaballi Village,
Siddaghatta Taluk,
appealing against the
office order regarding the
office of Shanbhag
of Hodda Tekally
and other Villages
of the said Taluk

As called for in
the above, has the
honor

Polie 29 October
Revenue Genl
3/10

Petitioners informed
Sd/- D'Souza
Records returned,
with enclosures.

No 1737 Pet dated 18.3.96
No 1793 Pet dated 1.4.96

honor to submit herewith as per accompanying list the proceedings connected with the case. -

2. The Amildar of Siddapatta has been directed to stay the execution of this office order pending the disposal of the appeal

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
Dy Commissioner

L R 1-95-96

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy-Commr
Kolar District.

Dated 27/10/96

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. Camp 16
No.

His docket-No 1361/345 dated 25th September 1896 submitting the records connected with the appeal of Narasinga Rao of Tekahalli, Sidlaghatta Taluk.

With reference to the above, has the honour to request that the entire correspondence between the Deputy-Commr and the Survey Supdt., regarding the office of Sarkar Shanbhog

of Tekkalli Firka, of which the marginally noted papers form part; and which has not been received with the above docket; may be forwarded to this office as early as practicable

1. Dy Comm's Yadi No 383 of 1894 to the Survey Supdt
2. Survey Supdt's Yadi No 6810 of 2.12.94 to the Dy Comr

By Order

27-10-96

Draft-
(as per 3rd Councillor's verbal order)

Secretary.

27/10/96.

Gen. 31]

189(7)

From

LR 1895-7

To

The Deputy Commr.
Kolar District.

Dated 7th

Despatched

Received Nov/96

General No. 4220
P. No. 625

Enclosure No.

In continuation of this office Camp Nº 16, dated 27th October last calling for certain additional records in connection with the appeal of Narasinga Row regarding the office of Shanbhog of Tekahalli Firka in the Siddaghatta Taluk, has the honour to request that the Deputy Commr will be good as to report whether the duties of all the four villages

comprising the Turka can
be satisfactorily discha
by a single officiator

By Order

Draft- 7/11/46
C2+3 For Secretary

S.V. 5/11.

19-6-97 (8) 1128

Gen. 31.]

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Gl. No. 8502 Ent.
Ref 729
17 JUN 97
DEWAN'S OFFICE.
(8)

Rep put up
AK
19/6/97.

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To
The Secretary to the
Government ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.
Revenue and General Depart.

Dated 10th
Despatched 16th } June 97
Received
General No. 4917
No. 1128

Enclosure No. 1 file

Submitting the records connected with the Petition of Narasinga Row regarding the office of Shanbhog of Dodda-Sebakalle

Petition M
17-6-97

Open file made
AK
28/6/97

Submitted
Visa
23/6

The case was once heard in Council in October 1896.
A memo giving the facts of the case & the import of the evidence recorded should be prepared for ~~received~~ submitted. (This will be done by Secretariat in the normal course)
M 3/7/97

Submd with memo
Hle
24.7.97
Sub to 2nd Council with a memo
M 27/7/97

Rec'd 18/6

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Office
Dated 10th June 1897.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue and General Depart.

Sir.

Adverting to your dockets Nos Camp 16 and 4220/625 dated 27th October and 7th November 1896 respectively regarding the petition of Narasinga Rao of Tekahalli village Siddaghatta Taluk appealing against this office order amending the office of Shanbhog of Dodda Tekahalli and other villages in the said Taluk, I have the honor in submitting herewith as per accompanying Tarist the additional records called for, to state that the duties of all the 4 villages comprising the Firka can be satisfactorily discharged by a single Officiator.

2. The particulars of area, assessment and population of each of the villages are noted in the margin.

I have the honorable,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
W Krishnaiengar
for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Name of village	Area in Sq. M.	Assessment Rs. As. P.	Population	Remarks.
1. Tekahalli	9 44 20	1292 12 0	688	The reports of Tekahalli and other villages are also the collections under this Circle.
2. Byraganahalli	8 07 11	256 4 0	133	
3. Anandamukkere.	4 21 15	1332 10 0		
4. Sadahalli.	7 02 9	232 12 0	8.	

Compd Seh

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:-

(1) Petition No. 3220/A.S.125 of 1895-96,

presented by Narasinga Rao of Tekhalli, Sidlaghatta Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Comr, Kolar, directing that Petr, a Sirkar Shanbhog to Sanoor ~~ceases charge of his office as~~ Ekn should be relieved of his Sirkar bhogi duties and the same put in charge of the Stala Shanbhog.

(2) ~~Docket~~ No. 1361/345-95-96 from the Dy Comr, Kolar District, and the records received therewith from which the facts appear as follow:-

The Dodda Tekhalli Pirka comprise 4 villages viz Doddi Tekhalli, Bairajanahalli, Sadhalli and Bandanmakere. There are 2 hakdar Shanbhogs to the Pirka viz Stala & Sirkar. The appellant Narasinga Rao represents the Sirkar Shanbhogi family and the Respondents represent the Stala Shanbhogi family. Since Sarwadhari 1886-87, Petr has been

in

1 C. correspondence enclosed with Ltr. No 4917/1128 dt 10/6/97

1895-96

in charge of Dodda Sekhalli and Baira-ganahalli while the Respondents ~~are~~ have been in charge of the remaining two villages.

At the Poligi Settlement about the year 1892 all the 4 villages were grouped in one pirka and its Poligi fixed at Rs 85½. At the same time the ~~Petr's~~ Appltˢ ~~Sheanbhogs~~ Inams were enfranchised on ~~payment of~~ half quit-rent and he was also relieved of his liability to do the work. In May 1893 the 1st Respondent Venkatasubbia petitioned the Taluk Amildar praying that the whole of the Poligi attached to the pirka might be paid to him. ~~Petr~~ The Appellant Narasingarao also having petitioned the Genl Asstt Comr. claiming a share of the Poligi amount, the latter after hearing both parties, passed an order directing that the Poligi of the pirka should be divided between the 2 Shanbhogs in proportion to their charges. On Venkatasubbia's appeal the Survey Supt. held that no Poligi was payable to the Sirkar Shanbhog as he had been sufficiently compensated by the enfranchisement of his Inam on payment of half quit-rent

quit-rent and relieved of his obligation to do the work. After some correspondence between the Survey Supt + the Dy Com + ~~Revenue Department~~ the latter ~~Deputy Commissioner~~ passed an order in December 95 ~~on representation~~ in accordance with the Survey ~~Petn's claim embodying the Survey~~ the applt's Supt's opinion that ~~Petr's~~ claim should be rejected and that he should be relieved of his work. ~~Petr~~ Applt has appealed to Govt against this order. On a reference made by this Office, the Dy Com, (3) Letter No. 4917/1128 dt. 8/10 June 97 reporting that the duties of all the 4 villages comprised in the Dod Jekkalli Sirkha can be satisfactorily managed by a single ~~man~~ officiator.

(320) Order thereon No. 21.96 dt. 25-8-97.

This is a clear case and involves no element of doubt or difficulty. The services of the appellant who is or was the Sirkar Shanbhog Narakanga Rao is the Sirkar Shanbhog. This service being no longer required his Inam was enfranchised on half quit-rent. This was the full compensation he could get

↑ reports that the duties of all the 4 Villages comprised in the Dod Jekkalli Sirkha can be satisfactorily managed by a single officiator

Encl: records

↑ Sirkar Shanbhogue being no longer required

get in addition to the relief from liability to do any work. Stala Shanbhog becomes the sole Shanbhog and gets the whole Poligi. This is in accordance with rules, and the Poligi allowance is not liable to be divided between the officiator and any other Sirkar Shanbhog. Narasinga Rao's appeal cannot in this view be supported and ~~must~~ should accordingly be dismissed.

C2+C3

~~For~~ Secretary

Draft

Bbn

23/8/97.

To The Deputy Commissioner Kolar &c.

with records.

25-8-97

(9)

3220 [illegible] 25-8-97

[illegible]

LA140-95-10

[illegible]

[illegible] 123 [illegible]

[illegible]

By Order

For Secretary

24/8/97

Draft
Bln
23/8/97

25-8-97

By Order

For Secretary